



AF: (initials)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Hironori SAHARA et al.**

Group Art Unit: **2873**

Serial No.: **10/635,641**

Examiner: **Alicia M. Harrington**

Filed: **August 7, 2003**

Confirmation No.: **8804**

For: **ULTRA-LIGHTWEIGHT ELECTROMAGNETIC WAVE CONCENTRATOR
AND METHOD FOR MANUFACTURE THEREOF**

Attorney Docket Number: **030943**

Customer Number: **38834**

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Mail Stop: AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

August 16, 2005

Sir:

Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection issued in the Office Action mailed May 17, 2005.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Rubin et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,733,246) in view of *Withoos* (U.S. Patent No. 4,171,563). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on a misunderstanding of the *Withoos* disclosure.

In particular, the Office Action states on page 3, first full paragraph:

Withoos teaches supporting a reflector with a structure that is recessed or grooved (see col. 3, lines 44-45).

Applicants respectfully assert that this statement is not correct and therefore cannot support the obviousness rejection. Reference to the cited *Withoos* text confirms that the recess or grooves are provided in a *matrix* instead of the reflector.

The obviousness rejection should be withdrawn as based on the misinterpretation of *Withoos*. Applicants elaborate as follows: